DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 518 CS 211 485

AUTHOR Spandel, Vicki
TITLE Speaking Skills: Report 2. Assessing Student Progress on the Common Curriculum Goals. English Language Arts.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 53p.; For other student progress assessment reports, see CS 211 484-490.
AVAILABLE FROM Documents Clerk, Oregon Department of Education, 700 Pringle Parkway, SE, Salem, OR 97310-0290 (single copies free, additional copies $3.50 each).
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Holistic Evaluation; Speech Communication; *Speech Skills; *Speech Tests; State Standards; *Student Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This report provides suggestions on how a language arts speaking skills assessment program could be structured to ensure that school districts meet the Common Curriculum Goals of the public elementary and secondary schools in Oregon. This report includes: (1) a list of common curriculum goals that relate to speaking; (2) general implications for assessment; (3) criteria for differentiating among insufficient, acceptable, and ideal assessment practices at the classroom and district levels; (4) a bibliography of speaking assessment sources; and (5) sample speaking assessment tools and procedures. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

English Language Arts

Assessing Student Progress on the Common Curriculum Goals

Report 2: Speaking Skills

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. J. Case

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Division of Curriculum and School Improvement
Oregon Department of Education

September 1988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Common Curriculum Goals Related to Speaking 1

Implications for Assessment 2

Classroom Level Speaking Assessment 3

Student Assessment for Program Evaluation 5

Bibliography 6

Appendix A: Speaking Assessment Resources

Appendix B: Speech Communication Association References

Appendix C: Speaking Assessment Procedures from Massachusetts Department of Education

Appendix D: Speech Rating Scales

Appendix E: Conversation and Group Discussion Evaluation Sheets

Oregon Schools . . .
A Tradition of Excellence!

The review of research and initial draft of this paper were done by Vicki Spandel, Independent Consultant, Portland, Oregon. The paper was revised to reflect comments from Oregon educators and published by the Department of Education.

Single copies of this document are available free of charge from the Documents Clerk, Oregon Department of Education (378-3589). Additional copies may be purchased for $3.50 per copy or reproduced without permission from the Oregon Department of Education.

Oregon Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway, SE
Salem, OR 97310-0290

Verne A. Duncan
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

September 1988

326311988700

ASSESSMENT OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS COMMON CURRICULUM GOALS

Report 2: Speaking Skills

School districts in Oregon are required in Standards for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 581-22-602 and -606 to use student assessment information on the Common Curriculum Goals to assist in making decisions about instruction of individual students and effectiveness of instructional programs. The standards suggest that a broad range of information is required to profile student and program progress and needs. There is also the assumption that instructional programs in schools have a clear alignment among the goals for instruction, the activities in the classroom, and the assessment of students' knowledge and skill.

This report provides suggestions on how a language arts speaking assessment program might be structured to ensure that districts carry out the intent of the state standards.

The suggestions offered within this report are based on what current research indicates works best in measuring speaking. Clearly, there may be differences in speaking assessment district to district, and even classroom to classroom within the same building. To the extent that classroom or program assessment approaches differ from what is suggested here, those differences should nevertheless reflect a sound research base.

This report includes:

1. A list of the Common Curriculum Goals that relate to speaking (keyed to the Essential Learning Skills).
2. General implications for assessment.
3. Criteria for differentiating among insufficient, acceptable and ideal assessment practices at the classroom and district levels.
4. Bibliography of speaking assessment sources.
5. Sample speaking assessment tools and procedures.

COMMON CURRICULUM GOALS RELATED TO SPEAKING

The following Common Curriculum Goals relate to speaking skills and include both formal and informal speaking as well as reasoning skills. Other Common Curriculum Goals may also be assessed through speaking activities (note particularly 2.4, 2.5, 2.8, 2.10). However, in order to avoid repetition in these reports, each Common Curriculum Goal appears only once in the area where it is most frequently and easily assessed. Where appropriate, the Common Curriculum Goals have been keyed to relevant Essential Learning Skills (ELS), which cut across curriculum areas.

Some procedures and resources are included later in this report which may be helpful in assessing speaking skills. However, it is NOT necessary that these Common Curriculum

Goals be individually assessed, nor assessed separately within different content areas. In other words, a well-structured performance-based speaking assessment—as an example—might well meet the assessment requirements for all the Common Curriculum Goals listed here.

Further, districts that are focusing on the Essential Learning Skills may find creative ways to structure assessments that touch on more than one curriculum area: speech and writing, for example, or speech and math. This integrative approach is encouraged to the extent that districts find it a natural and logical outgrowth of their preferred assessment procedures; however, it is also perfectly acceptable for districts to assess different curriculum areas separately.

Common Curriculum Goals (Relevant to Speaking)

Students will:

2.1 Speak and read orally with standard pronunciation, appropriate volume, rate, gestures and inflections (ELS 1.3).

2.2 Use oral communication to give and receive information, directions, and for enjoyment (ELS 2.3).

2.3 Use group discussion skills appropriately.

2.6 Select and use language, gestures and symbols appropriate to audience, purpose, topic and setting when planning oral and written presentations (ELS 5.5).

2.15 Use oral communication to influence others and to respond to persuasion (ELS 4.2).

2.16 Demonstrate an appreciation of writing and oral communication skills as a lifelong means of self-expression, learning and personal development.

2.20 Formulate and support a position orally and in writing using appropriate information and sound argument (ELS 6.5).

2.21 Reflect upon and improve own reasoning in oral and written communications (ELS 6.6).

IMPLICATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT

The process of developing an oral presentation is similar to the process of writing. In the classroom setting, teachers can assess student skills in both the development process and the final product. Student skills in group discussions and other everyday applications of speaking should also be evaluated.

In assessing the development of a presentation, three stages may be examined—planning, practicing, and revising. In the planning stages, teachers should review written materials such as note cards, outlines, idea sheets, etc. as students design the presentation and plan for the audience (CCG 2.6).

As students begin to formulate their presentations, observations can be made as they practice and receive feedback from small groups or partners on their pronunciation, volume, rate, language, gestures, and symbols (CCG 2.1, 2.2, 2.6). Sample peer-evaluation forms are included in the appendices. Some group discussion skills (CCG 2.3) may also be assessed at this stage. Judgments about revisions made in response to peer or teacher feedback may be ongoing when students practice and refine their presentations.

The final presentation involves assessment of a variety of skills including language, delivery, organization, and responsiveness to audience feedback, both verbal and nonverbal (CCG 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 2.16). Depending on the type of presentation, it may be possible to include judgments about persuasion (CCG 2.15) and argumentation or debate (CCG 2.20). Checklists or score sheets (see appendices) can be helpful evaluation instruments in addition to serving as recording tools for comments and feedback.

When students engage in small and large group discussions, a variety of speaking skills may be assessed. It may be helpful to use a checklist (see appendices) or to collect student reactions to the discussion activity as part of the assessment. Potential areas include language, delivery, organization, group process skills, appreciation, persuasion, argumentation, and reasoning (CCG 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.15, 2.16, 2.20, 2.21). Feedback to students should provide specific information related to the goals.

CLASSROOM LEVEL SPEAKING ASSESSMENT

Guidelines for Insufficient/Acceptable/Ideal Assessment Practices

The following examples are intended to be illustrative of the procedures and practices districts might follow in assessing students' speaking skills. Note that at the first (INSUFFICIENT) level, the practices followed, while not necessarily inherently wrong, are insufficient to ensure compliance with Standard 602. At the second (ACCEPTABLE) level, the practices extend beyond what is described as INSUFFICIENT, and—though not ideal—are likely to ensure minimal compliance with Standard 602. At the third (IDEAL) level, the practices described are likely to exceed the minimal requirements for compliance but still to be within the reach of districts. It is hoped that this IDEAL level will serve as a goal for which most districts will aim in practice.

INSUFFICIENT Teachers primarily assess students' speaking skills through objective tests and short response items, with one or two oral reports per year. Students may not be aware of the criteria used to judge their oral presentations and typically receive a grade after some time has passed since the presentation. Feedback to students and parents is in the form of a grade which is reported to parents at the end of the term.

Students typically do not receive feedback on everyday speaking activities, such as class and group discussions, and everyday applications. Teacher feedback centers on correctness of content.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

ACCEPTABLE

Teachers may administer an objective usage test, but primarily assess speaking and speaking-related skills through observation of performance. Students will be expected to do individual presentations, engage in small and large group discussion, and apply speaking skills in everyday situations. Feedback is based on agreed-upon written performance criteria which align with the Common Curriculum Goals and which are carefully discussed with students in advance of any assessment.

Students have at least three or four opportunities during the school year to plan and give oral presentations to the class using a variety of modes: e.g., recounting of an experience, persuasive speech, interpretation of poetry. Criteria for judging performance are tied to the specific mode, context or purpose of the presentation.

Assessment incorporates not only evaluation of formal presentations, but also observation of students' performance in everyday speaking contexts (e.g., during large- and small-group discussions). Students have opportunity to provide extended responses during discussions, so that assessment can focus not only on the content, but also on the student's ability to listen to others, to integrate ideas, to formulate new hypotheses and questions, and to establish connections among various sources. Other real-life applications might include making a phone call or participating in a job interview. Teachers record results of students' performance and discuss evaluations with students individually in light of agreed-upon criteria and achievement of the Common Curriculum Goals.

* * * * * * * * * * *

IDEAL

In addition to the acceptable level, students are expected to make more oral presentations and the teacher provides both oral and written student feedback. Students have an opportunity to participate in the development of performance criteria.

Students are taught to use the performance criteria. The teacher models acceptable and desirable performance to clarify the criteria and to give students an opportunity to apply the criteria.

The teaching and assessment of speaking skills are integrated with reading, listening, writing and other curriculum areas. Peer groups are used to plan presentations and assess one another's performance.

Teachers record results of students' performance and track changes over time.

STUDENT ASSESSMENT FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION

Guidelines for Insufficient/Acceptable/Ideal Assessment Practices

When evaluating a program, one of the sources of information is student achievement data. In addition, the program philosophy, goals, materials and other characteristics should be reviewed and evaluated. The student achievement data will help to identify where strengths and weaknesses might exist in the current program. The following examples are intended to be illustrative of the procedures and practices districts might follow in assessing student achievement for program evaluation. At the first (INSUFFICIENT) level, the practices followed, while not necessarily inherently wrong, are insufficient to meet the standards. At the second (ACCEPTABLE) level, the practices would ensure at least minimal compliance with the standards. The third level (IDEAL) exceeds minimum compliance but should still be in reach of districts.

INSUFFICIENT — Performance assessment is nonsystematic and is not tied to agreed-upon, written criteria. Speaking performance may be assessed only as part of a larger high school competency assessment or other regular assessment cycle.

* * * * * * * * * * *

ACCEPTABLE — Students are assessed through a common scoring system based on established criteria used in the classroom. Performance is assessed by teachers who are trained to use the approved scoring scale. Samples of students at several grade levels are assessed periodically. The district-level assessment may be based on data collected from classroom assessments, provided the district has a means of ensuring enough consistency to allow interpretation of that data across classrooms.

* * * * * * * * * * *

IDEAL — The link with classroom assessment is particularly strong, with the same assessment criteria being used for classroom assessment and instruction as is used for program assessment. Classroom teachers, trained to use the scoring criteria, assess students' performance in a series of common speaking exercises used across classrooms. The assessment also incorporates the judgments of other trained teachers (e.g., from another classroom, school or district) to help validate the scoring. Assessment occurs at least two or three times prior to program evalution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Publications on Speaking Assessment

Bock, Douglas G. and E. Hope Bock. Evaluating Classroom Speaking: Theory and Research Into Practice. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1981.

Bridgeford, Nancy, Vicki Spandel and Richard Stiggins. Classroom Assessment: A Key to Educational Excellence. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1984.

Diederich, Paul B. Measuring Growth in English. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE (Stock No. 31093), 1974.

English Language Arts: Oral Communication (Paper Number 1). A concept paper prepared for the Oregon Department of Education. Salem, Oregon, May 1987.

Friedrich, Gustav W., ed. Education in the 80's: Speech Communication. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1981.

Gere, Anne Ruggles and Eugene Smith. Attitudes, Language and Change. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1979.

Rubin, Don L. and Nancy A. Mead. Large Scale Assessment of Oral Communication Skills: Kindergarten Through Grade 12. Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1984.

Wood, Barbara Sundene, ed. Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Grades Pre K–6. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, April 1977.

Wood, Barbara Sundene, ed. Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Grades 7–12. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, April 1977.

APPENDIX A

SPEAKING ASSESSMENT RESOURCES

SPEAKING ASSESSMENT RESOURCES

The following organizations have conducted speaking assessments or have materials related to speaking assessment and can provide telephone consultations and limited written material.

Salem-Keizer School District
Charleen Hurst (399-3031)

Valley Education Consortium
Glen Fielding (838-1220 x 391)

INDEPENDENT CONSULTANTS

Judy Arter
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Test Center
101 SW Main, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97208
275-9562

The Test Center can provide bibliographies and sample instruments for checkout and review.

Lance Cooley
McKay High School
2440 Lancaster Dr NE
Salem, OR 97305-1292
399-3080

Lance provides training in speaking assessment, especially at the classroom level.

Robert Martin
Western Oregon State College
Monmouth, OR 97361-1394
838-1220

Bob provides training in speaking assessment, especially at the classroom level.

Rick Stiggins
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 SE Main, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97208
275-9500

Rick can provide training on applying performance assessment techniques to assessing speaking skills in the classroom.

Other Speaking Material Available from Department of Education

1. Salem-Keizer School District. Training videotape and support materials to train teachers to rate student speaking skills. (Available for checkout and review from the Department of Education Information Resource Center, 378-8471. Materials may be purchased for $9.50 plus shipping from Video Transfer Center, 1501 SW Jefferson, Portland, 97201, 226-5091.)

2. Valley Education Consortium. Procedures for Assessing Selected Speaking and Listening Skills, 1984.

   Provides sample procedures to assess student speaking skills in grades K-12. Includes non-verbal communication, performing social rituals, giving directions and summarizing messages orally, expressing and supporting an idea or point of view, and effective use of voice. It also includes an analytic scale for evaluating speaking.

3. Gere, Anne Ruggles and Eugene Smith. Attitudes, Language and Change. Urbana, IL: NCTE (Stock No. 02174), 1979.

   Includes several self-assessment checklists on appropriate language usage for formal or informal situations. (Available for check-out and review from the Department of Education, Information Resource Center, 378-8471. It may be purchased for $7.50 plus $1.25 shipping from NCTE, 1111 Kenyon Drive, Urbana, IL 61801.)

4. Development of an Oral Communication Assessment Program: The Glynn County Speech Proficiency Examination for High School Students. Glynn County School System, Brunswick, GA, 1981.

   This report on the development of a speaking performance assessment includes an interview and a public hearing testimony simulation. Available for check-out and review from the Department of Education, Information Resource Center, 378-8471.

5. Listening and Speaking in the English Language Arts Curriculum K-12: A Manual for Teachers. New York State Department of Education, 1988 (Draft).

   Provides a variety of activities at all grade levels including several self-evaluation forms and teacher checklists. Available for check-out and review from the Department of Education, Information Resource Center, 378-8471.

APPENDIX B

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION REFERENCES

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES

FOR ASSESSING SPEAKING AND LISTENING*

The following criteria may be applied to published and unpublished instruments and procedures for assessing speaking and listening skills of children and adults. The criteria are organized around (a) content considerations, which deal primarily with the substance of speaking and listening instruments and procedures, and (b) technical considerations, which deal with such matters as reliability, validity and information on administration.

1. Stimulus materials should require the individual being tested to demonstrate skill as a speaker or listener.

2. Assessment instruments and procedures should clearly distinguish speaking and listening performance from reading and writing ability; i.e., inferences of speaking and listening competence should not be made from tests of reading and writing, and directions and responses for speaking and/or listening tests should not be mediated through reading and writing modes.

3. Assessment instruments and procedures should be free of sexual, cultural, racial, and ethnic content and/or stereotyping.

4. Assessment should confirm the presence or absence of skills, not diagnose reasons why individuals demonstrate or fail to demonstrate those skills.

5. Assessment should emphasize the application of speaking and listening skills that relate to familiar situations; i.e., stimulus materials should refer to situations recognizable to the individual being tested and should facilitate demonstration of skills rather than demonstration of content mastery.

6. Assessment should test skills that are important for various communication settings (e.g., interpersonal small group, public, and mass communication settings) rather than be limited to one setting.

7. Assessment should permit a range of acceptable responses, where such a range is appropriate.

8. Assessment should demonstrate that outcomes are more than just chance evidence; i.e., assessment should be reliable.

9. Assessment should provide results that are consistent with other evidence that might be available.

10. Assessment should have content validity.

11. Assessment procedures should be standardized and detailed enough so that individual responses will not be affected by the administrator's skills in administering the procedures.

12. Assessment procedures should approximate the recognized stress level of oral communication; they should not increase or eliminate it.

13. Assessment procedures should be practical in terms of cost and time.

Reprinted with permission of Speech Communication Association.

14. Assessment should involve simple equipment.

15. Assessment should be suitable for the developmental level of the individual being tested.

*Developed by Philip M. Backlund, Kenneth L. Brown, Joanne Gurry, and Fred E. Jandt acting as a subgroup of the Speech Communication Association's Educational Policies Board Task Force on Assessment and Testing. Approved and endorsed by the Educational Policies Board and the Administrative Committee of the Speech Communication Association.

cs/CURR1792
090288

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

SUBCOMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS AND PAPERS

1979 – 1984

Backlund, P. (1981). A National Survey of State Practices in Speaking and Listening Assessment. In R. Stiggins (Ed.), Perspectives on the Assessment of Speaking and Listening Skills for the 1980s. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Backlund, P.M., Brown, K.L., Gurry, J., & Jandt, F. (1979). Criteria for Evaluating Instruments and Procedures for Assessing Speaking and Listening. SPECTRA. 15, 5. Also published in the 1982 Resources for Assessment in Communication. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Backlund, P.M., Brown, K.L., Gurry, J., & Jandt, F. (1980). Evaluating Speaking and Listening Skill Assessment Instruments: Which one is Best for You? Language Arts, 57, 621–627.

Backlund, P.M., Brown, K.L., Gurry, J., & Jandt, F. (1982). Recommendations for Assessing Speaking and Listening Skills. Communication Education, 31, 9–18.

Backlund, P., Booth, J., Moore, M., Parks, A. M., & Van Rheenen, D. (1982). A National Survey of State Practices in Speaking and Listening Skill Assessment. Communication Education, 31, 125–130.

Brown, K. L. (1979, October). Assessment of basic oral communication skills: A selected annotated bibliography. Annandale, VA: ERIC and Speech Communication Association.

Brown, K. L., Backlund, P., Gurry, J., & Jandt, F. (1979). Assessment of Basic Speaking and Listening Skills: State of the Art and Recommendations for Instrument Development: Vols. 1 and 2. Boston: Bureau of Research and Assessment, Massachusetts Department of Education.

Gray, P. A. (1984). Assessment of basic oral communication skills: A selected, annotated bibliography. Annandale, VA: ERIC and Speech Communication Association.

McCaleb, J. (1983, February). An analysis of measures of teachers' oral communications. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Detroit.

McCaleb, J. (1983). The assessment of oral communications of teachers. Teacher Talk, 2, 5–6.

Moore, M. (1984, July). State and higher education efforts in listening assessment: A status report. Paper presented at the lst annual summer conference of the International Listening Association, St. Paul, MN.

Reprinted with permission of Speech Communication Association.

Moore, M. (1984). Current state department listening efforts. In C. Coakley (Ed.), Listening: Competencies, curriculum and assessment challenges confronting state departments of education (Proceedings of the lst Annual Summer Conference of the International Listening Association). St. Paul: International Listening Association.

Rubin, D. L. (1981). Using performance rating scales in large scale assessment of speech proficiency. In R. Stiggins (Ed.), Perspectives on Oral Communication Assessment for the 1980's. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Center for Applied Performance Testing.

Rubin, D. L. (1981, April). Uses of Performance Rating Scales in Large Scale Assessment of Oral Communication Proficiency. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Rubin, D. L. (1981, November). Review of Speaking and Listening Tests, Prek – 12. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA.

Rubin, D. L. (1981, November). Evaluating Communication Attitudes. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Boston.

Rubin, D. L. (1982). Review of Brendon J. Carroll, Testing Communicative Performance: An Interim Study. English Education, 14, 99–101.

Rubin, D. L. (1983). Testimony submitted to the National Commission on Excellence in Education, United States Department of Education, submitted by the Speech communication Association Committee on Assessment and Testing. Communication Education, 32 439–441.

Rubin, D. L. (1983, November). Developments in teaching, assessing and disseminating oral communication, K–College. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Rubin, D. L., Daly, J. A., McCroskey, J.C., & Mead, N. A. (1982). A review and critique of procedures for assessing speaking and listening skills among Kindergarten through grade 12 students. Communication Education, 31, 285–303

Rubin, D. L., Mead, N. A. (1984). Large-scale assessment of oral communication skills: Kindergarten through grade 12. Annandale, VA: ERIC/RCS and the Speech Communication Association.

Rubin, R. B. (1982, October). Assessing college communication competencies. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association of Ohio, Columbus, OH.

Rubin, R. B. (1982, November). Oral communication assessment procedures and instrument development in higher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY.

Rubin, R. B. (1984). Communication assessment instruments and procedures in higher education, Communication Education, 33, 178–180.

Rubin, R. B. Moore, M. R., Sisco, J. I. & Quianthy, R. (1983). Oral communication assessment procedures and instrument development in higher education. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

cs/CURR1792
090288

ASSESSMENT OF BASIC ORAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS

A Selected, Annotated Bibliography

Prepared by

Philip A. Gray
Department of Communication Studies
Northern Illinois University
May 1984

Distributed by the Speech Communication Module-ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 5105 Backlick Road, Annandale, VA 22003. This bibliography may be reproduced for free distribution without permission of the Speech Communication Module. Ordering information for ERIC materials (ED and EJ numbers) can be found on page 4 of this bibliography.

This bibliography includes materials for educators who are concerned with assessment of basic speaking and listening skills, especially in the context of minimal competency testing and basic skills improvement programs. The bibliography is divided into two sections. The first includes materials that address broad assessment issues, review a variety of test instruments, and report assessment practices throughout the states. The second contains sources that focus specifically on the assessment of speaking, listening, and functional communication skills.

GENERAL SOURCES ON ASSESSMENT ISSUES AND INSTRUMENTS

Achievement Testing and Basic Skills. Proceedings of the national conference on achievement testing and basic skills. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and National Institute of education, 1979. This report covers various basic skills issues — use of test results, implications of tests for poor and minority children, cultural considerations, and the Federal role in testing.

Bloom, B.S.; Hastings, J.T.; and Maddaus, G.F. Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971. Distinguishes between formative and summative evaluation with chapters on evaluating language development in preschool education and elementary school language arts. Each chapter presents objectives, illustrates testing procedures, and discusses commercial tests.

Reprinted by permission of the Speech Communication Association

Bostrom, R., (ed.) Competence In Communication, An Interdisciplinary Perspective. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1984. Book examines crosscultural, interpersonal, organizational, developmental, and mass communication perspectives on competence in communication.

Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, James V. Mitchell, Jr., (Ed.). Tests In Print III. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1983. A standard reference for information on published tests. Lists an index to tests, test reviews, and literature on specific tests.

Clark, J.P., and Thomson, S.D. Competency Tests and Graduation Requirements. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976. (ERIC ED 126 160; available in microfiche from EDRS.). Provides a background to the competency testing movement and reports on nationwide initiatives in the use of applied performance tests. Reviews a variety of competency tests that measure skills achievement. The revised edition by James W. Keefe and Nancy De Leonibus is available in microfiche from EDRS (ERIC ED 194 573); paper copy can be purchased from NASSP, 1904 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091.

Dickson, W.P., (Ed.) Children's Oral Communication Skills. New York, Academic Press, 1981. Chapters on a process-structuralist view of communication competency, cognitive and comprehension monitoring, skill acquisition, etc.

Fagan, W.; Cooper, C.; and Jensen, J. Measures for Research and Evaluation In the English Language Arts. Urbana, Il: National Council of Teachers of English, 1975. (ERIC ED 099 835). Reviews over 100 unpublished instruments for assessing language development, listening, and standard English as a second language, as well as literature, reading, teacher competency, and miscellaneous language skills.

Fisher, B.A., (Ed.). Western Journal of Speech Communication. Western Speech Communication Association (Lynn Wells, Executive Secretary, Saddleback Community College). (Vol. 48, No. 2, Spring 1984). A special issue on children's communicative development including conversational competency, acquiring sociolinguistic knowledge, differences between comprehension and production of language, impact of TV advertising, role-taking, and development from birth. (Indexed in ERIC CIJE).

Haney, W. Standards for Tests and Test Use. Staff Circular No. 3. Cambridge, MA: Huron Institute, 1978. Reviews six sets of standards concerning standardized tests (including those of APA and AERA) and discusses the impact of these standards on testing practices.

Haney, W. Testing the Tests. Staff Circular No. 1. Cambridge, MA: Huron Institute, 1978. Reviews past efforts to rate the quality of standardized tests. Discusses implications as well as problems in assessment of test quality.

Johnson, O.G. Tests and Measurement In Child Development: Handbook II. (Vols 1 and 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976. Describes 900 unpublished tests and measures of child development (birth through age 18). The measures are classified in 18 major categories.

Perspectives on communication competency. Three articles offering differing perspectives on competency. See James C. McCroskey, "Communication competence and performance: a research and pedagogical perspective," Communication Education, (Vol. 31, No. 1, Jan. 1982, pp 1–7). McCroskey argues the need to separate concepts of communication competency and communication performance. (ERIC ED 203 401). Gerald M. Phillips, "A competent view of 'competence'." Communication Education, (Vol. 33, No. 1, Jan 1984, pp 25–36). Phillips addresses the preoccupation with definitions and measurement of competence. He suggests that the locus of interest should be shifted to techniques for training performance improvement. And, Brian H. Spitzberg, "Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression," Communication Education, (Vol. 32, No. 3, July 1983, pp 323–329). This essay proposes that competence be viewed as a function of knowledge, skill, and motivation. Compares this perspective with McCroskey's. (Last two articles indexed in ERIC CIJE.).

Perspectives on the Assessment of Speaking and Listening Skills for the 1980's. AERA Symposium. Published by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1981. (ERIC ED 210 748; also available from SCA).

Petty, W.T. and Fielding, L. Developing Children's Language. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980. Defines language and language arts, surveys language learning, and describes the development of language instruction. Several chapters on listening and oral language and expression.

Rubin, R.B., "Communication assessment instruments and procedures in higher education," Communication Education, (Vol. 33, No.2, April 1984, pp 178–180). A summary report by the SCA Committee on Assessment and Testing describing the range and degree of assessment occurring in colleges and universities. (Indexed in ERIC CIJE).

Scott, L. (Ed.). Summary of the Fall 1978 Conference of the National Consortium on Testing. Cambridge, MA: Huron Institute, 1978. Describes current state of criterion–referenced testing, alternative approaches to assessment and reviews of major standardized test series.

Simon, A., and Boyer, E.G. Mirrors for Behavior III: An Anthology of Observation Instruments. Wyncote, PA: Communication Materials Center, 1974. A review of observation systems that measure various dimensions of the communication process in the classroom.

State Practices in Speaking and Listening Assessment. Speech Communication Association (No. 423). Article and backup information on state positions for K–12 programs in speech.

Wiemann, J.M., and Backlund, P.M., "Current theory and research in communicative competence," Review of Educational Research, (Vol. XV, Spring 1980, pp 185–199). Includes a review of relevant research. (Also see ERIC ED 155 763.).

SOURCES ON ASSESSMENT OF SPEAKING, LISTENING, AND FUNCTIONAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Allen, R.R., and Brown, K.L. (Eds.). Developing Communication Competence in Children. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1976. (May be purchased from SCA). Literature review, behavioral study of children's communication competencies, and an assessment of teachers' attitudes regarding goals of speech communication instruction. Also contains a framework and objectives for functional communication instruction.

Allen, R.R., and Wood, B.S., "Beyond reading and writing in communication competence," Communication Education, (Vol. 27, Nov. 1978, pp 286–292). Argues for developing competencies in an array of communication situations involving speaking and listening as well as reading and writing. Five functions of communication are offered as the communication focus of a language arts program. (ERIC EJ 201 016).

Backlund, P.; Gurry, J.; Brown, K.; and Jandt, F., "Evaluating speaking and listening skills assessment instruments: Which one is best for you?" Language Arts, (Vol. 57, No. 6, Sept. 1980, pp 621–627). Focuses on need for assessment of skills that accounts for differences between those unique to oral language and those unique to written language. (ERIC EJ 233 979).

Backlund, P.; Gurry, J.; Brown, K.; and Jandt, F., "Recommendations for assessing speaking and listening skills," Communication Education, (Vol. 31, No. 1, Jan. 1982, pp 9–18). Authors continue to clarify and develop criteria introduced in the 1980 article. (ERIC EJ 257 625).

Bassett, R.E.; Whittington, N.; and Staton-Spicer, A., "The basics in speaking and listening for high school graduates: What should be assessed?" Communication Education, (Vol. 27, Nov. 1978, pp 293–303). Recommends twenty speaking and listening competencies for high school graduates. Illustrates how each competency can be applied in occupational, citizenship, and maintenance situations. (ERIC EJ 201 017).

Faires, C.L., "The development of listening tests," (ERIC ED 220 528). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Education Research Association, Nov. 1980. Critical of most test instruments for poor construction, sample size, reporting of test item analysis data, and lack of replication.

Illinois State Board of Education, Assessing Oral Communication Skills, Springfield, IL: ISBE, (free from ISBE, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Il, 62777). Booklet suggesting classroom observation techniques for assessing oral communication skills. Uses a checklist approach

Larson, C.E., "Problems in assessing functional communication," Communication Education, (Vol. 27, Nov 1978, pp 304–309). Emphasizes that problems in assessing functional communication have their origin in conceptual ambiguity. Contrasts communicative competence with functional effectiveness and proposes the latter as a more appropriate construct for older children and adults. (ERIC EJ 201 018).

Larson, C.; Backlund, P; Redmond, M.; and Barbour, A. Assessing Functional Communication. Falls Church, VA; Speech Communication Association, 1978. (ERIC ED 153 275; also available from SCA). Part I identifies and describes conceptual and methodological issues involved in evaluating the major components of interpersonal interaction related to functional communication. Part II contains brief reviews of 90 instruments designed to generate information on some aspect of functional communication.

Lederman, L.C., and Ruben, B.D., "Systematic assessment of communication games and simulations: an applied framework," Communication Education, (Vol. 33, No. 2, April 1984, pp 152–159). Establishes a framework for the assessment of communication games and simulations. Specifies criteria and provides a model for the selection/design, use, and assessment of activities. (Also indexed in ERIC CIJE).

Lundsteen, S.W. Listening: Its Impact At All Levels On Reading And The Other Language Arts. (Rev. ed.). Urbana, Il: National Council of Teachers of English, 1979. (ERIC ED 169 537). A review of research in listening including definitions and evaluation methods. Presents a listening taxonomy and describes commercial, unpublished, and teacher–designed assessment instruments and procedures.

Monge, P.R.; Bachman, S.G.; Dillard, J.P.; and Eisenberg, E.M., "Communicator competence in the workplace: Model testing and scale development," Communication Yearbook 5. (M. Burgoon, ed.) New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1981, pp 505–527. Assessing competencies on the job.

Rubin, D.; Daly, J.; McCroskey, J.; and Mead, N., "A review and critique of procedures for assessing speaking and listening skills among preschool through grade twelve students," Communication Education. (Vol. 31, No. 4, Oct. 1982, pp 285–304). Review and critique of 45 available listening and speaking assessment instruments. Recommendations for further research and development. (ERIC EJ 269 962).

Rubin, R., "Assessing speaking and listening competence at the college level: the communication competency assessment instrument," Communication Education. (Vol. 31, No. 1, Jan. 1982, pp 19–32). Report on the CCAI, a test of basic communication skills for college students. (ERIC EJ 257 626).

Rubin, R.B. Communication Competency Assessment Instrument, 3/4" video stimulus tape (No. 901, $85), testing manual (No. 902, $15), 50 rating sheets (No. 903, $9.50). Also available as a starter package for $198 (1 tape, 3 manuals, 10 pkgs. rating sheets) (No. 900) from SCA. A college level assessment instrument designed to measure 19 speaking and listening competencies.

Rubin, R.B.; Moore, M.R.; Sisco, J.; and Quianthy, R. Oral Communication Assessment Procedures and Instrument Development in Higher Education (No. 426) (ERIC ED 236 721; also available from the Speech Communication Association.) Report by the SCA Subcommittee for Oral Communication Assessment in Higher Education.

SCA Guidelines for Competencies in Speaking and Listening for High School Graduates. Brochure available from the Speech Communication Association. Single copy free with self–addressed stamped envelope. (No. 414).

Stohl, C., "Developing a communicative competence scale," Communication Yearbook 7. (Robert N. Bostrom, ed.) Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983, pp 685–716. Study defines communicative competence (focusing on 3–5 year old children), briefly reviews methods of assessment, and provides a report of the empirical investigation.

Trank, D.M., and Steele, J.M., "Measurable effects of a communication skills course: an initial study," Communication Education. (Vol. 32, No. 2, April 1983, pp 227–236). Study examined the amount of growth in both writing and peaking competence over a semester of instruction. Utilized the speech and writing portions of ACT's College Outcome Measures Project. (ERIC EJ 277 822).

Wood, B.S. (Ed.). Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Pre-K – Grade 6. and Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Grades 7–12. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1977. (ERIC ED 137 858 and 859; also available from SCA.). The first describes the child as a competent communicator and discusses techniques that encourage functional communication competence. The second booklet focuses upon the adolescent and teenager.

Work, W., "ERIC report: testing – who's being tested, by whom, by what means, for what, and how well?" Communication Education. (Vol. 216, 1977, pp 338–344). Provides a sample of ERIC documents representative of those in the system focusing on the evaluation of communication instruction programs. (ERIC EJ 173 268).

ED numbers refer to education documents in Resources in Education (RIE), the ERIC monthly abstract journal. Unless otherwise indicated, documents are available on microfiche in libraries housing ERIC collections, or they can be purchased in microfiche or reproduced paper copy from ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. For prices check latest issue of RIE or write to the Speech Communication Module for an EDRS order blank/price form. Several of the ERIC sources can be obtained in published paper book directly from the Speech Communication Association (SCA), 5150 Backlick Road, Suite E, Annandale, VA 22003.

EJ numbers are education journal articles indexed in Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE), the ERIC monthly index. Reprints from these articles are available from University Microfilms International. Current issues of Communication Education can also be purchased from the Speech Communication Association; back issues from the Johnson Co., 355 Chestnut St., Norwood, NJ 07468.

CURR/1791/ll/sa
9/6/88

APPENDIX C

SPEAKING ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE SPEAKING ASSESSMENT

Objectives and Assessment Design

The speaking assessment was designed to measure the 14 speaking objectives identified by the Massachusetts Basic Skills Improvement Policy (see Exhibit 2). Like the listening objectives, some of the speaking objectives deal with general speaking skills that apply to all speaking situations, for example, Objective A–1, Use Words and Phrases Appropriate to the Situation. Other objectives deal with specific speaking situations, for example, Objective C–1, Use Survival Words To Cope With Emergency Situations.

A set of speaking rating scales were developed for the speaking assessment. These scales were used in two ways:

- For classroom observation by teachers.
- For one–on–one assessment by trained raters.

The following sections describe the speaking rating scales, the teacher observation approach, the one–on–one approach and how the approaches are combined into a two–staged assessment.

Speaking Rating Scales

A set of four scales was developed to measure the objectives that deal with general speaking skills. Each scale measures one dimension of speaking skills. The dimensions are:

- Delivery
- Organization
- Content
- Language

The delivery dimension focuses on Objectives A–2, A–3 and A–4 and is concerned with how well a student transmits messages. It assesses how well a student uses appropriate volume, rate and articulation while speaking. The organization dimension focuses on Objectives B–1 and B–2 and is concerned with how well a student structures messages. It assesses how well a student expresses the sequence or the relationship of ideas. The content dimension focuses on Objectives A–1, B–3, B–4 and C–2 and is concerned with how well a student provides an adequate amount of relevant information to meet the requirements of various speaking tasks. In addition, it assesses how well a student adapts the content of messages to specific listeners and situations. The language rating focuses on Objective B–5 and is concerned with how well a student uses appropriate grammar and vocabulary while speaking.

Reprinted with permission of Massachusetts Department of Education

Within each speaking dimension, performance is rated using a 4–point scale:

1 = Inadequate
2 = Minimal
3 = Adequate
4 = Superior

The dimensions and the levels of the rating scales are explained in the "Speaking Assessment Ratings Guide," found in Appendix B.

The Teacher Observation Approach

The teacher observation approach is a general measure of a student's speaking performance. In the statewide assessment, two teachers (who had the same student currently enrolled in class) independently rated the student's general speaking performance in class using the speaking rating scales. Usually one of the teachers was an English teacher and the other from another subject area where students participate in a fair amount of classroom discussion and interaction, such as history, government or science.

Teachers were asked to read the "Speaking Assessment Ratings Guide" and then to complete the ratings. Teachers based their ratings of a student on their observation of the student's performance in normal classroom activities such as asking questions, responding to questions, explaining how to do something, giving a report to the class, or talking with other students in discussion groups. They considered the student's overall performance since the beginning of the semester.

The One–on–One Approach

The one–on–one approach is a focused measure of a student's speaking performance. In the statewide assessment, a trained rater rated the student's performance using the same speaking rating scales used by teachers for the teacher observation approach. However, instead of basing ratings on classroom observations, the rater gave the student specific speaking tasks and rated the student's oral response to these tasks.

Each rater was provided with one day of training in the one–on–one approach. The rater assessed each student individually. The rater gave the student several speaking tasks and rated the student's performance on each task along the four dimensions. Thus, for each task, the rater gave the student a rating from 1 to 4 for delivery, organization, content and language. The ratings were assigned immediately after the student's response.

The speaking tasks used in the one–on–one approach reflect the objectives that deal with specific speaking situations. The tasks include:

- A description
- An emergency
- A sequence
- A persuasion task

The description task focuses on Objective C–4 and is concerned with how well a student can describe an object, event or experience so that another person would know something about the topic. The emergency task focuses on Objective C–1 and is concerned with how well a student can provide the necessary information in an emergency so that another person could send help. The sequence task focuses on Objective C–3 and is concerned with how well a student can explain a sequence of steps so that another person could follow the sequence. The persuasion task focuses on Objective C–5 and is concerned with how well a student can present effective arguments so that another person would be persuaded by the student's point of view.

The focus of all of the speaking tasks was on the student's effectiveness in transmitting messages--not on the specific content of the messages. Tasks were developed that were familiar to all students and did not require any special knowledge or experience. The tasks were field tested with 9th graders and 12th graders from inner–city, suburban and rural schools to assure that they would be relevant for a wide variety of students of various ages.

Based on field test results, four tasks (one of each type) were selected for the final version of the one–on–one speaking test used for the statewide assessment and four additional tasks for each of the three alternate forms of the test. The tasks were selected so that they were as similar as possible in content. These tasks were approved by the Department of Education's Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity as being "substantially free of offensive sexual, cultural, racial and ethnic content and stereotyping." Further information from the statewide assessment was used to create three alternate forms of the test that were equivalent in difficulty. The text of the state speaking tasks is provided in Appendix C.

The Two–Staged Approach

The rationale for developing a two–staged approach for assessing speaking is based on the need for measures that are reliable, valid and free of bias. The teacher observation approach provides a general measure of student performance. It assesses all types of speaking tasks as they occur in a natural situation. However, sometimes a general measure such as this one allows for extraneous factors, such as academic achievement or sociability, to enter into the ratings. The one–on–one approach provides a focused measure of student performance. It assesses only a few types of speaking tasks in a contriving setting. However, it focuses entirely on speaking variables and uses standardized procedures. The two approaches complement one another and, taken together guard against the many problems of reliability, validity and bias that are a particular concern in speaking measures.

Another reason for the two–staged approach is the need for measures that are feasible for large–scale use by school districts in the future. The intention is to use the teacher observation approach as a screening measure and to use the one–on–one approach as a back–up measure in cases where a student's level of ability is in question. School districts would use the teacher observation measure to assess all students in a grade. They would use the one–on–one measure to assess students whose level of ability is in question. The one–on–one measure would be used when two teachers do not agree in their observation ratings of a student.

Before final plans are made for implementing the speaking measures in school districts, it is necessary to demonstrate that the two approaches are reliable and valid. Initial tests of the reliability and validity of the measures were conducted during the statewide assessment. However, further study will be undertaken before final recommendations are made regarding how the measures should be used by school districts. The instrument is still in the developmental stages and has not yet been approved for use in implemental stages and has not yet been approved for use in implementing the speaking component of the Basic Skills Improvement Policy.

Results of the Speaking Assessment

On the average, students performed adequately in all areas of the speaking assessment. Their average ratings for the teacher observation approach and the one-on-one approach were about the same, both falling just below 3 on a 4-point scale.

The average rating of students for the teacher observation ratings across all dimensions was 2.95. The averages for each speaking dimension ranged from 2.91 for Delivery to 2.99 for Content. Thus, the level of performance did not vary much from dimension to dimension.

The average rating of students on the one-on-one ratings across all dimensions and tasks was 2.89, slightly lower than the average rating for the teacher observation ratings. The ratings summarized across speaking dimensions ranged form 2.85 for Content to 2.94 for Language. The ratings summarized across speaking tasks ranged from 2.84 for Description to 2.97 for Emergency. Thus, similar to the teacher observation results, the level of performance on the one-on-one ratings did not vary much from dimension to dimension or from task to task.

Most of the ratings (79 percent) assigned to students in the one-on-one assessment were 3s which reflect adequate performance. Very few ratings (about 1 percent) were 1s, inadequate performance and few rating (about 6 percent) were 4s, superior performance. Of interest is the small but noticeable percentage of 2 ratings (about 17 percent), which reflect minimal performance. Another result that demonstrates a lack of skills among some students is the failure of 18 percent of the students to mention the nature and location of the emergency in the emergency task.

Reliability and Validity of the Speaking Approaches

In addition to the analysis of student performance, several steps were implemented prior to and during the assessment to test the reliability and validity of the speaking approaches.

The reliability of the teacher observation approach was determined by examining the consistency of the ratings of two teachers of the same student. Approximately 95 percent of the ratings were either identical or adjacent (within one point of one another). There were no systematic differences in the ratings of different types of teachers; i.e., English teachers compared with other teachers.

The reliability of the one–on–one approach was determined by examining the consistency of the ratings of the trained raters for the same student. In a test of inter–rater reliability conducted prior to the assessment, raters assigned identical ratings 85 percent of the time. Rater consistency was determined after the assessment by rescoring 10 percent of the students' responses. Rescoring was conducted by project staff who were reliable raters. In this test, raters assigned identical ratings 75 percent of the time.

The validity of the speaking approaches was determined by expert judgment and empirical tests. Prior to the assessment, a panel of communication experts independently examined and speaking tasks and speaking dimensions and in a blind review, matched them to the speaking objectives. In general, the panel agreed almost unanimously with respect to the categorization of tasks and most of the time with respect to the categorization of speaking dimensions. Based on the reviewers' comments, adjustments were made in the tasks and dimensions so that they better reflected the objectives.

The degree to which the two assessment approaches were measuring the same thing, concurrent validity, was determined by comparing the teacher observation ratings and one–on–one ratings for the same student. Ratings were combined to form a total teacher observation score and an adjusted total one–on–one score, both scores ranging from 8 to 32. In 81 percent of the cases the scores were within 4 points of one another and in 98 percent of the cases scores were within 8 points of one another.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Introduction

The main purpose of the statewide assessment is to collect information on the listening and speaking performance of 12th graders. A secondary purpose of the assessment is to collect background information that provides additional insight into the performance of students and baseline information prior to the implementation of the Basic Skills Improvement Policy.

Background information was collected through questionnaires administered to principals, teachers and students participating in the assessment. Some of the questions focused on the nature of the school environment, including general descriptive information and specific aspects of school programs that might influence listening and speaking skills. Other questions focused on characteristics of the student, including general descriptive information and specific factors that might impact listening or speaking skills.

Some of the background questions asked for factual information. All of the background questions rely upon the self–reported responses of principals, teachers and students. Thus, the data reflect the perceptions and opinions of the individuals responding to the questions. Also, since the sample was designed to be representative of students, not schools, the results of the Principal Questionnaire cannot be generalized to all secondary schools in Massachusetts.

Results of Background Questionnaires

The results of the Principal Questionnaire indicate that most schools included some listening and speaking skills in the curriculum and extracurricular program. However, principals felt there was deficit in the skills of many students and a need for more instruction. Sixty-four percent of the principals stated that there was not enough emphasis on listening instruction and 69 percent stated that there was not enough emphasis on speaking instruction. Fifty-three percent of the principals felt that students can graduate without knowing how to listen or speak very well.

The results of the Student Questionnaire indicate that they do not receive much instruction in listening or speaking but that they believe these skills are important. Ninety-three percent of the students have rarely been given work in school aimed at improving listening skills and 90 percent have rarely been given work in school aimed at improving speaking skills. Eighty-three percent stated that students should learn the skills in the listening test and 92 percent stated that students should be able to do the tasks in the one-on-one speaking test before they finish high school. However, almost half of the students felt that students currently can graduate without knowing how to speak or listen very well.

The results of the Teacher Questionnaire indicated that participating teachers did not have major problems implementing the teacher observation ratings. Eighty-six percent of the teachers had no trouble understanding the "Speaking Ratings Guide" and over 90 percent felt confident about the accuracy of the ratings they made of students' speaking performance.

USE OF MASSACHUSETTS BASIC SKILLS TESTS AND MATERIALS

The listening and speaking tests and accompanying materials are restricted for use in Massachusetts schools for the specific purpose of implementing the Massachusetts Basic Skills Improvement Policy and Regulations. Circulation, distribution, duplication or use for other purposes requires written permission from the Massachusetts Department of Education.

Researchers, Department of Education officials from other states and personnel from school districts outside Massachusetts interested in using these materials for data collection and/or further research and development are encouraged to contact the Massachusetts Department of Education. In general, permission for use will be granted for appropriate purposes, subject to certain conditions.

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ASSESSMENT OF BASIC SKILLS

SPEAKING ASSESSMENT RATINGS GUIDE

OVERVIEW

There are numerous kinds of speaking tasks that students must perform in everyday life, both in school and out of school. The Massachusetts Basic Skills Improvement Policy has focused on some of these tasks, including describing objects, events and experiences, explaining the steps in a sequence, providing information in an emergency and persuading someone.

In order to accomplish a speaking task, the speaker must formulate and transmit a message to a listener. This process involves deciding what needs to be said, organizing the message, adapting the message to the listener and situation, choosing language to convey the message and finally delivering the message. The effectiveness of the speaker may be rated in terms of how well the speaker meets the requirements of the task.

The Massachusetts test of basic skills in speaking separates speaking skills into four dimensions:

Delivery
Organization
Content
Language

Delivery is concerned with the transmission of the message, i.e., volume, rate and articulation. Organization is concerned with how the content of the message is sequenced and how the ideas are related to one another. Content is concerned with the amount of relevance of information in the message and how the content is adapted to the listener and situation. Language is concerned with the grammar and words which are used to convey the message.

Each of the four dimensions is rated on a four point scale: 1 is the lowest rating and 4 is the highest rating. A general set of principles underlies the rating scale for all four components. Ratings of 1 reflect speaking skills which are inadequate in meeting the requirements of the task. Ratings of 2 reflect speaking skills which are minimal in meeting the requirements of the task. Ratings of 3 reflect speaking skills which are adequate in meeting the requirements of the task. Ratings of 4 are superior in meeting the requirements of the task.

Individuals who act as raters for the speaking assessment need to take the role of a naive, objective listener. The rater must be naive so that the rater can base his or her rating on exactly what the speaker says. The rater must be careful not to let his or her own knowledge and experience influence the rating. The rater must face each speaker as if it were a new experience. The rater must also be objective so that he or she does not let a particular set of norms of social acceptability influence the rating. The rater must evaluate the speaker in terms of how well the speaker meets the requirements of the speaking task, irrespective of the particular communication style the speaker uses.

DELIVERY

The delivery rating focuses on the transmission of the message. It is concerned with volume, rate and articulation. Articulation refers to pronunciation and enunciation. Some examples of poor articulation include mumbling, slurring words, stammering, stuttering and exhibiting disfluencies such as ahs, uhms or "you knows."

1 = The delivery is inadequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The volume is so low that you cannot understand most of the message.
- The rate is so fast that you cannot understand most of the message.
- The pronunciation and enunciation are so unclear that you cannot understand most of the message.

2 = The delivery is minimal in meeting the requirement of the task.

e.g.,
- The volume is too low or too loud.
- The rate is too fast or too slow. Pauses are too long or at inappropriate spots.
- The pronunciation and enunciation are unclear. The speaker exhibits many disfluencies such as ahs, uhms or "you knows."
- You are distracted by problems in the delivery of the message.
- You have difficulty understanding the words in the message. You have to work to understand the words.

3 = The delivery is adequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The volume is not too low or too loud.
- The rate is not too fast or too slow. Pauses are not too long or at inappropriate spots.
- The pronunciation and enunciation are clear. The speaker exhibits few disfluencies, such as ahs, uhms and "you knows."
- You are not distracted by problems in the delivery of the message.
- You do not have difficulty understanding the words in the message.

4 = The delivery is superior in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The speaker uses delivery to emphasize and enhance the meaning of the message. The speaker delivers the message in a lively, enthusiastic fashion.
- The volume varies to add emphasis and interest.
- Rate varies and pauses are used to add emphasis and interest.
- Pronunciation and enunciation are very clear. The speaker exhibits very few disfluencies such as ahs, uhms or "you knows."

NOTE: In articulation you may be concerned with accent. However, articulation should be rated with respect to your ability to understand the message, not the social acceptability of the accent. One particular accent is not considered better than another. REMEMBER, in this component you are rating how the student speaks, not what the student says.

ORGANIZATION

The organization rating focuses on how the content of the message is structured. It is concerned with sequence and the relationships among the ideas in the message.

1 = The organization is inadequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The message is so disorganized that you cannot understand most of the message.

2 = The organization is minimal in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The organization of the message is mixed up; it jumps back and forth.
- The organization of the message appears random or rambling.
- You have difficulty understanding the sequence and relationships among the ideas in the message. You have to make some assumptions about the sequence and relationships of ideas.
- You cannot put the ideas in the message into an outline.

3 = The organization is adequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The message is organized.
- You do not have difficulty understanding the sequence and relationships among the ideas in the message. You do not have to make assumptions about the sequence and relationships of ideas.
- You can put the ideas in the message into an outline.

4 = The organization is superior in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The message is overtly organized.
- The speaker helps you understand the sequence and relationships of ideas by using organizational aids such as announcing the topic, previewing the organization, using transitions and summarizing.

NOTE: Make sure you are not unconsciously "filling in" organization for a speaker, because you happen to know something about the speaker's topic. If you have to make assumptions about the organization, this fact should be reflected in your rating. REMEMBER, in this component you are rating how the student organizes the message, not what the student says.

CONTENT

The content rating focuses on the specific things which are said. It is concerned with the amount of content related to the task, the relevance of the content to the task and the adaptation of the content to the listener and the situation.

1 = The content is inadequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The speaker says practically nothing.
- The speaker focuses primarily on irrelevant content.
- The speaker is highly egocentric. The speaker appears to ignore the listener and the situation.

2 = The content is minimal in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The speaker does not provide enough content to meet the requirements of the task.
- The speaker includes some irrelevant content. The speaker wanders off the topic.
- The speaker adapts poorly to the listener and the situation. The speaker uses words and concepts which are inappropriate for the knowledge and experiences of the listener (e.g., slang, jargon, technical language). The speaker uses arguments which are self-centered rather than other-centered.

3 = The content is adequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The speaker provides enough content to meet the requirements of the task.
- The speaker focuses primarily on relevant content. The speaker sticks to the topic.
- The speaker adapts the content in a general way to the listener and the situation. The speaker uses words and concepts which are appropriate for the knowledge and experience of a general audience. The speaker uses arguments which are adapted to a general audience.

4 = The content is superior in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g.,
- The speaker provides a variety of types of content appropriate for the task, such as generalizations, details, examples and various forms of evidence.
- The speaker adapts the content in a specific way to the listener and situation. The speaker takes into account the specific knowledge and experience of the listener, adds explanations as necessary and refers to the listener's experience. The speaker uses arguments which are adapted to the values and motivations of the specific listener.

NOTE: This rating is concerned with content in terms of quantity, relevance and adaptation. It is not concerned with content in terms of accuracy. Concerns with accuracy of content fall outside a speaking skills assessment. Also, make sure you are not unconsciously "filling in" content for a speaker because you happen to know something about the speaker's topic. If you add information, this fact should be reflected in your rating. REMEMBER, in this component you are rating the quantity, relevance and adaptation of what the student says, not the accuracy of what the student says.

LANGUAGE

The language rating deals with the language which is used to convey the message. It is concerned with grammar and choice of words.

1 = The language is inadequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g., • The grammar and vocabulary are so poor that you cannot understand most of the message.

2 = The language is minimal in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g., • The speaker makes many grammatical mistakes.
• The speaker uses very simplistic, bland language. The speaker uses a "restricted code," a style of communication characterized by simple grammatical structure and concrete vocabulary.

3 = The language is adequate in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g., • The speaker makes few grammatical mistakes.
• The speaker uses language which is appropriate for the task, e.g., descriptive language when describing, clear and concise language when giving information and explaining, persuasive language when persuading. The speaker uses an "elaborated code," a style of communication characterized by complex grammatical structure and abstract vocabulary.

4 = The language is superior in meeting the requirements of the task.

e.g., • The speaker makes very few grammatical mistakes.
• The speaker uses language in highly effective ways to emphasize or enhance the meaning of the message. As appropriate to the task, the speaker uses a variety of language techniques such as vivid language, emotional language, humor, imagery, metaphor, simile.

NOTE: In language you may be concerned with students who come from backgrounds where a foreign language or a non-standard form of English is spoken. However, language should be rated with respect to your ability to understand the message, not the social acceptability of the communication style. If a speaker's use of incorrect or non-standard English grammar interferes with your ability to understand the message, this fact should be reflected in your rating. REMEMBER, in this component you are rating how the student conveys the message through language, not what the student says.

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ASSESSMENT OF BASIC SKILLS

ONE-ON-ONE SPEAKING TASKS

Description Task:

Think about your favorite class or extracurricular activity in your school. Describe to me everything you can about it so that I will know a lot about it. (How about something like a school subject, a club or a sports program?)

Emergency Task:

Imagine that you are home alone and you smell smoke. You call the fire department and I answer your call. Talk to me as if you were talking on the telephone. Tell me everything I would need to know to get help to you. (Talk directly to me; begin by saying hello.)

Sequence Task:

Think about something you know how to cook. Explain to me step-by-step how to make it. (How about something like popcorn, a sandwich or eggs?)

Persuasion Task:

Think about one change you would like to see made in your school, like a change in rules or procedures. Imagine I am the principal of your school. Try to convince me that the school should make this change. (How about something like a change in the rules about hall passes or the procedures for enrolling in courses?)

llc/CSI1214
9/2/88

EXHIBIT 2. Speaking Objectives
Massachusetts State Department of Education

A. BASIC ORAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS

1. Use words and phrases appropriate to the situation. (2.1)
2. Speak loudly enough to be heard by a listener or group of listeners. (2.1)
3. Speak at a rate the listener can understand. (2.1)
4. Say words distinctly. (2.1)

B. PLANNING, DEVELOPING AND STATING SPOKEN MESSAGES

1. Use words in an order that clearly expresses the thought. (2.2, 2.6)
2. Organize main ideas for presentation. (2.5)
3. State main ideas clearly. (2.8)
4. Support main ideas with important details. (2.5, 2.8)
5. Demonstrate knowledge of standard English usage. (2.6)

C. COMMON USES OF SPOKEN MESSAGES

1. Use survival words to cope with emergency situations.
2. Speak so listener understands purpose.
3. Ask for and give straightforward information. (2.2)
4. Describe objects, events and experiences. (2.2, 2.6)
5. Question others' viewpoints. (2.3)

*Number in parentheses indicate English Language Arts Common Curriculum Goals for Oregon which are related to the Massachusetts objectives.

APPENDIX D

SPEECH RATING SCALES

EVALUATION FORMS*

The following pages contain sample evaluation forms that may be useful in various kinds of classrooms. Their intended uses are described below.

Introduction Rating Scale. This form is used for evaluating the introduction in a speech. The assignment is to present a one–to–two minute introduction to a speech. Even short assignments like this deserve to be evaluated.

Speech Rating Scale. This scale is used to evaluate both informative and persuasive speeches. It was originally used at the University of Iowa, but has undergone extensive revision based on our research. The subquestions in each category serve as criteria for making the judgment about the category and provide helpful information to raters.

Speech Rating Blank. This scale was developed and tested in a middle school classroom. Its strength is that it only asks for yes and no judgments. It should be noted that any of these forms can be used at the elementary and middle school levels. It is a matter of adapting the language and the criteria, rather than the entire form.

Oral Interpretation Rating Blank. This scale was developed for use in evaluating oral interpretation assignments. Note that it has more categories because it is used in a special situation. Many people do not like to use numbers when evaluating oral interpretation, but our research shows that it has worked just as well as letter grades.

Short Speech Feedback Form. This form is shortened in that is contains fewer cues on how to evaluate each category. It has more space for written comments, however. This form is useful in later assignments when everyone is familiar with all the criteria in each category.

Overall Comments

It should be noted that any of these forms can be extended by using the back of the page for further comments. Comments are very helpful for the student, and the evaluator, whether student or teacher should be encouraged to use the back of any of these or other rating forms for extensive comments.

*Taken from Bock, Douglas G. and E. Hope Bock. Evaluating Classroom Speaking. ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Urbana, Ill.; Speech Communication Association, Annandale, Va., 1981.

INTRODUCTION RATING SCALE

Speaker _____ Date _____

	Comments	Score
Attention		_____
Does the introduction attract favorable attention?		
Are the attention factors obvious?		
Topic		_____
Does it state the topic clearly?		
It is obvious on which side of the topic the speaker stands?		
Is it clear where the speaker is headed with the topic?		
Credibility		_____
Does the intro establish initial credibility?		
Does the speaker use the sources of credibility?		
Delivery		_____
Is the speaker communicative?		
Was the eye contact direct?		
Were the gestures meaningful?		
Total		_____

---

10 superior — 7 average — 4 inadequate — 1 poor

Comments:

Total Points
50-45 = A
44-40 = B
39-35 = C
34-30 = D
39-00 = F

I.D.# _____

Speech Rating Scale

Speaker _____ Date _____

Subject _____ Assignment _____

Items	Comments	Score
Organization: Clear arrangement of ideas? Introduction, body, conclusion? Was there an identifiable pattern?		
Language: Clear, accurate, varied, vivid? Appropriate standard of usage? In conversational mode? Were unfamiliar terms defined?		
Material: Specific, valid, relevant, sufficient, interesting? Properly distributed? Adapted to audience? Personal credibility? Use of evidence?		
Delivery: Natural, at ease, communicative, direct? Eye contact? Aware of audience reaction to speech? Do gestures match voice and language?		
Analysis: Was the speech adapted to the audience? Did the main points support the purpose?		
Voice: Varied or monotonous in pitch, intensity, volume, rate, quality? Expressive of logical or emotional meanings?		

Total _____

Scale:

10	7	4	1
superior	average	inadequate	poor

I.D.# _____

Speech Rating Blank

Name _____ Date _____

Subject of the Speech _____ Teacher _____

After you listen to each of the speakers, answer the following questions with a yes or a no. These questions will be used to help us decide which areas are important to us when preparing to give a speech, and how we may improve our speeches in the future.

Organization—how the speech is put together or arranged.

1. Could you easily pick out the main ideas of the speech? _____
2. Did the speech have an introduction? _____
3. Did the speech have a body? _____
4. Did the speech have a conclusion or summary _____
5. Was the speech developed or put together in a way that made it easy for the audience to understand? _____

Language—the sentence structure of each speech.

1. Were the explanations clear? _____
2. Was the language easy to understand? _____
3. Did the speaker make use of pauses to separate ideas from one another? _____
4. Were there too many and's or uh's used? _____
5. Was it easy to tell where one sentence stopped and the next one began? _____

Material—what the speech was actually about.

1. Was the subject interesting to you? _____
2. Was the speech easy for you to understand? _____
3. Did the speaker seem really to know the subject matter? _____
4. Did the speaker seem comfortable and at ease while giving the speech? _____
5. Was there eye contact with the audience? _____
6. Was the speaker aware of how the audience was reacting to the speech? _____
7. Did the speaker make good use of gestures and body language? _____
8. Did the main idea stand out above the other ideas? _____
9. Were there other ideas less important but still necessary in the development of the speech? _____

Voice—how the speaker sounded.

1. Was the speaker's voice pleasing to the ear? _____
2. Was the pitch varied—that is, did it go up and down? _____
3. Was the speaker loud enough? _____
4. Did the speaker talk too fast? _____
5. Did the speaker use good expression? _____

Total Score _____ (add the number of "yes" responses)

Grade _____

ORAL INTERPRETATION RATING BLANK

Reader_____ Assignment_____ Total Score_____

Item	Comment	Score
1. Introduction: Captures attention, sets the scene and mood, given needed background, informative.		
2. Material: Of interest to the audience? Is it adapted to the reader, assignment, occasion, and audience? Proper cutting?		
3. Eye contact: Does the reader try to reach each member of the audience? Is there too much dependence on the manuscript? Is there effective character placement?		
4. Articulation and pronunciation: Is it clear, correct, slurred, muffled? Are there defective sounds? Acceptable standards of pronunciation?		
5. Facial expression: Appropriate, varied, adapted to the reading? Does it aid in expressing the emotions in the selection?		
6. Poise: Confident, at ease, personality pleasing moves easily, projected to the audience? Aware of audience reaction to the reading?		
7. Bodily action: Is the reader animated? Are posture, action, and gestures constructive or distracting? Are gestures used effectively, varied, suited to content and purpose?		
8. Vocal quality: Is it pleasant to listen to? Is there sufficient variety, projection, clarity? Acceptable volume?		
9. Rate and timing: Are rate and pauses varied and suited to content and purpose? Too fast or too slow?		
10. Content: Communicated author's intent as stated in the introduction? Was the content adequate to support the reader's goal as stated in the introduction?		

Scale: _____ Total Score

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

superior average inadequate poor

Additional Comments: I.D.# _____

11c/CSI1245
9/7/88

SHORT SPEECH FEEDBACK FORM

Name: _____ **Topic:** _____

Item	1	2	3	4	Comments
Clearly stated thesis					
Examples Direct support Clear explanation					
Eye contact					
Gestures					
Body position					

_____ Evaluator

_____ Grade

Key: 1 = Needs a lot of work.
2 = Doing well some of the time.
3 = Doing well most of the time.
4 = Excellent job--keep it up.

NAME _____ CLASS _____ DATE _____

COMPREHENSIVE SPEECH EVALUATION
Sheet for Teachers

NAME _____ DATE _____

CLASS _____ SCORE _____

TOPIC: _____

TIME LIMIT: _____ TIME TAKEN: _____

TOPIC AND PURPOSE

Topic significant and limited? _____

Specific purpose established? _____

DELIVERY

Mental Alertness

Awareness of each idea presented? _____

Obvious sense of communication? _____

Style

Natural? _____

Projects good will? _____

Body

Eye contact adequate? _____

Posture acceptable? _____

Movement appropriate? _____

Gestures effective? _____

Voice

Distinct? _____

Vocal variety adequate? _____

Rate appropriate? _____

Pitch appropriate? _____

Volume appropriate? _____

Fluency adequate? _____

Vocalized pauses avoided? _____

LANGUAGE

Uses expressions appropriate to oral communication? _____

World choice appropriate? _____

Conveys ideas clearly? _____

Grammar correct? _____

Pronunciation correct? _____

Increases interest and impact? _____

CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION

Introduction

Gets attention? _____

Gives needed information? _____

Makes purpose clear? _____

Relates topic to audience? _____

Gains good will of audience? _____

Development

Main points clearly stated? _____

Organization

Well-structured? _____

Logically sound? _____

Transitions effective? _____

Reprinted by permission of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Orlando, Fla.

NAME _____ CLASS _____ DATE _____

Supporting Material

Clear? _____

Sufficient? _____

Logical? _____

Interesting? _____

Convincing? _____

Visual aids effective? _____

Conclusion

Emphasizes main points? _____

Provides a note of finality? _____

Ends with audience interest high? _____

COMMENTS:

NAME _____ CLASS _____ DATE _____

PEER EVALUATION FORM

SPEAKER: _____ **TOPIC:** _____

Indicate your evaluation by placing an X in the appropriate box following each item.

	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Fair	None
CONTENT	5	4	3	2	1
Attention-getting device					
Clear purpose statement					
Clear organization of ideas					
Effective use of language					
Interesting audiovisual aids					
Selection of main ideas					
Adequate summary					
Closing statement					
DELIVERY					
Volume					
Eye contact					
Vocal expression/tone					
Facial expression					
Poise/self-control					
Pronunciation/Articulation					

COMMENTS: What I liked most about your speech was _____

_____

_____

If you could improve one element of your speech, I would suggest that you try to _____

_____

_____

Reprinted by permission of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Orlando, Fla.

APPENDIX E

CONVERSATION AND GROUP DISCUSSION EVALUATION SHEETS

NAME _____ CLASS _____ DATE _____

GROUP DISCUSSION PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

(Ungraded)

Identify the procedure your group followed and evaluate your group's performance by responding to the items below. Write your responses in your communication journal.

1. Identify the leader in the group. Explain the process followed to designate that person as leader.

2. Did the leader accept responsibility effectively? What was the leader's style—laissez faire, authoritarian, democratic?

3. Who, if anyone, did not participate adequately in the preparation and discussion? What specific efforts were made to get the person involved? What, in your opinion, caused the difficulty with their participation?

4. List specific actions people in your group took to create a cooperative effort toward getting tasks completed. Also, describe how you decided to divide the work.

5. List specific instances in which members of your group made preparation or discussion more difficult or less effective.

6. Comment on the cohesiveness of the group. List specific instances of consensus, compromise, cooperation, etc.

7. If you had to work with the same people again, what would *you* do differently? Be specific.

8. List the names of the members of your group, beginning with the strongest contributor and ending with the weakest contributor.

   1.

   2.

   3.

   4.

   5.

   6.

   7.

Reprinted by permission of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Orlando, Fla.

NAME _____ CLASS _____ DATE _____

Situation	Often	Usually	Seldom	Never	NA
11. I help others understand me by explaining what I think, feel, and believe.					
12. I use various forms of nonverbal communication to express myself in conversations.					

NAME _____ CLASS _____ DATE _____

CONVERSATION SKILLS
Self-Evaluation Sheet

Read the items below and check the response that best describes you in the situation.
(NA = not applicable to me)

Situation	Often	Usually	Seldom	Never	NA
1. When I don't understand instructions, I say so.					
2. In conversation, I seem to talk more than others.					
3. I let the other person finish talking before I reply.					
4. I find my mind wandering while others talk.					
5. I ask questions to gain a better understanding of what others are saying.					
6. I pretend to be listening when I am not.					
7. I can usually detect differences between what people are saying and what they may be feeling.					
8. When speaking, I pay attention to feedback from others.					
9. My words come out the way I want them to in conversation.					
10. I assume others know what I mean.					

(continued)

Reprinted by permission of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Orlando, Fla.

Name _____ Date _____ Class _____

EVALUATION SHEET FOR GROUP DISCUSSION

Directions: List the appropriate names in the first column. Then, rank your classmates in each category, using the following symbols: + = *excellent*, √ = *adequate*, and – = *needs improvement*.

Part 1: Group Leader

Name	Preparation	Introduction	Encouraging Participation	Clarifying	Timing	Summarizing

Part 2: Participants

Name	Preparation	Level of Participation	Clarity of Expression	Open-Mindedness	Courtesy	Listening

© 1988 by Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632

Reprinted by permission of Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ